

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 were pending in the application. Upon entry of this Response, claims 16-24 will be presented for examination, claims 1-15 having been canceled in this paper, and new claims 16-24 added.

Minor informalities in the specification have been corrected as indicated above.

In rejecting former claims 1-15, the Examiner relied upon a combination of the Plantz and Ross references. For reasons set forth below, it is believed that the newly added claims 16-24 are allowable over these references.

The Plantz reference is generally concerned with a system in which a group of authors is managed to produce a group-authored project. In Plantz's system, authors are able to create portions of a group-authored work, and the portions of the work are made available for review and editing by editors.

The Ross reference is concerned with desktop publishing software which permits a layout of a document to be changed without re-entering the content of the document. Both initial layout of the document and subsequent revision of the layout are managed by a "wizard" which allows the author to select layout parameters via a menu.

Claim 16 is directed to a "method" which includes "allowing a content creator to log into a system" and "providing a content type specific template to the content creator", where the content type specific template is "associated with a particular content type of a plurality of content types supported by the system". The claimed method further includes "allowing the content creator to create a draft by using the content type specific template" and "selecting at least one of a reviewer and an editor from among a plurality of reviewers and editors accessible via the system". The selecting of the at least one of a reviewer and an editor is "based at least in part on the content type specific template". Finally, claim 16 recites "transmitting the draft to the selected at least one of a reviewer and an editor".

Support for the limitation of allowing a content creator to log into a system is found at page 15, line 10 of the specification. Support for the limitation of providing a content type specific template to the content creator is found at page 15, line 18 to page 16, line 5. Support for the limitation that the content type specific template is associated with a particular content type of a plurality of content types supported by the system is found at page 4, line 22 to page 5, line 3. Support for the limitation of allowing the content creator to create a draft by using the content type specific template is found at page 16, lines 4-5 and page 17, lines 15-16. Support for the limitation of selecting at least one of a reviewer and an editor from a plurality of reviewers and editors accessible via the system, based at least in part on the content type specific template is found at page 17, lines 16-19. Support for the limitation of transmitting the draft to the selected at least one of a reviewer and an editor is found at page 17, lines 19-22.

Applicants wish to particularly emphasize the feature of claim 16 which recites selecting a reviewer or editor to receive the draft based at least in part on the content type specific template used to create the draft. It is respectfully submitted that this feature is not taught or suggested by the prior art relied upon by the Examiner. While the Examiner considered that the combination of the Plantz and Ross references would result in a group authoring system which provides templates to authors, the references do not teach or suggest that an editor to review a document created on the system may be selected based on the template used to create the document. It is therefore respectfully urged that claim 16 is allowable over the references.

Claim 17 is dependent on claim 16 and recites the additional limitation of allowing the content creator to select the content type specific template from among a plurality of content type specific templates supported by the system. Support for this limitation is found at page 15, line 18 to page 16, line 4 of the specification.

Claim 18 is dependent on claim 17 and recites that the plurality of content type specific templates include four templates respectively suitable for creating a website document, an e-mail, an alert and branded content. Support for these limitations is found at page 4, line 22 to page 5, line 2 and page 8, line 23 to page 9, line 7.

Claim 19 is dependent on claim 16 and further recites the limitation of allowing the selected at least one of a reviewer and an editor to review the transmitted draft. Support for this limitation is found at page 18, line 23 to page 19, line 5.

Claim 20 is dependent on claim 16 and further recites the limitations of applying a tag to the draft, with the selecting of the at least one of a reviewer and an editor being based at least in part on the tag applied to the draft. Support for these limitations is found at page 16, lines 5-16.

Since claims 17-20 are all directly or indirectly dependent on claim 16, these claims are believed to be allowable on the same basis as claim 16. Moreover, the feature recited in claim 20 of selecting a reviewer or editor for a draft based at least in part on a tag applied to the draft is not taught or suggested by the references relied upon by the Examiner and so is believed to provide independent support for the allowability of claim 20.

Claim 21 is directed to a “method” which includes “allowing a content creator to log into a system”, “allowing the content creator to create a draft in the system”, “applying a tag to the draft” and “selecting at least one of a reviewer and an editor from among a plurality of reviewers and editors accessible via the system”. The selecting of the at least one of a reviewer and an editor is “based at least in part on the tag applied to the draft”. Finally, claim 21 recites “transmitting the draft to the selected at least one of a reviewer and an editor”.

Support for the limitation of allowing a content creator to log into a system is found at page 15, line 10 of the specification. Support for the limitation of allowing the content creator to create a draft in the system is found at page 16, lines 4-5 and page 17, lines 15-16. Support for the limitation of applying a tag to the draft is found at page 16, lines 5-8. Support for the limitation of selecting a reviewer or editor based at least in part on the tag applied to the draft is found at page 16, lines 12-16. Support for the limitation of transmitting the draft to the selected at least one of a reviewer and an editor is found at page 16, lines 12-16.

The Plantz and Ross references do not teach or suggest either applying tags to drafts or selecting a reviewer or editor to receive the draft based at least in part on a tag applied to the draft. Indeed, both references are silent as to tagging, and so cannot possibly teach selecting a

reviewer or editor based at least in part on a tag. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 21 is allowable over the references relied upon by the Examiner.

Claim 22 is dependent on claim 21 and recites the additional limitation that the system automatically applies the tag to the draft. Support for this limitation is found at page 16, line 5.

Claim 23 is dependent on claim 21 and recites the additional limitation that the content creator applies the tag to the draft. Support for this limitation is found at page 17, lines 5-7.

Claim 24 is dependent on claim 21 and further recites the limitation of allowing the selected at least one of a reviewer and an editor to review the transmitted draft. Support for this limitation is found at page 18, line 23 to page 19, line 5.

Since claims 22-24 are all dependent on claim 21, these claims are believed to be allowable on the same basis as claim 21.

Conclusion

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,



January 20, 2004

Date

Nathaniel Levin
Registration No. 34,860
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
5 Elm Street
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-3460